

### **REMARKS**

In the Office Action mailed on March 8, 2007, the Examiner objected to the Specification and rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

By means of the present Amendment, the Specification has been amended. Applicant submits that no new matter has been introduced in the present Amendment. Support for these Amendment can be found, for example, in the originally-filed Abstract, and pages 1-4 of the Specification.

In view of the Amendment to the Specification, together with the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all grounds of rejection and objection.

#### **Objection to the Specification**

The Examiner objected to the Abstract of the Specification for including the word “said.” To address the Examiner’s objection, the word “said” has been replaced by “the” in the present Amendment. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added and requests that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the Abstract.

#### **Rejection of Claim 1 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Independent claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,744,006 to Mausser et al. (hereinafter “Mausser”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,905,910 to Wuestner (hereinafter “Wuestner”) and the 2000 IEEE publication (hereinafter “Fuentes”). The Office Action suggests that Mausser discloses applicant’s claim limitations except for each of the two rollers comprising their own electric motor drives, wherein the electric motors are interconnected to each other by an electrical shaft.

Claim 1 recites in relevant part a “compacting press for powdery to granular bulk materials comprising two counter-rotating rollers ... held in a roller housing by bearing blocks ... wherein the roller housing with a vertical design comprises two separate parts, namely a bottom part comprising one of said rollers and a top part with the loose roller, wherein said top part is held by a swivel bearing to the bottom part and is lockable, wherein the top part can be swiveled open by way of the swivel bearing.”

In contrast, Mausser discloses a device for dewatering mixtures of fibrous and liquid materials. Mausser teaches that roller housing (press unit 1) is divided in two separate parts, namely a bottom part (lower press frame portion 12) and an upper part (upper press frame portion 11). The rolling housing/press frame portions 11 and 12 include bearing blocks (bearing housings 15 and 16). The bearing blocks each hold a bearing (4 and 5) and a roller (2 and 3). The Office Action recites on pages 2-3 that Mausser discloses a roller housing 15, 16 and bearing blocks 4 and 5. This is not accurate. 15 and 16 refer to the bearing blocks and 4 and 5 refer to the bearings. [Column 3, lines 1-20.] The frame portions 11 and 12 in Mausser correspond to the two separate parts of the roller housing claimed by Applicant.

Accordingly, Mausser fails to disclose that the frame portions 11 and 12 are held by a swivel bearing and that the top part can be swiveled open by way of the swivel bearing, as recited in claim 1. Swiveling open the top part and the bottom parts allows one or both rollers to be installed or deinstalled. Rather, Mausser teaches that the two frame portions 11 and 12 are interconnected by releasable members 13. Mausser does not disclose releasing releasable members 13 to allow the two frame portions 11 and 12 to swiveled open. Indeed, the two frame portions 11 and 12 do not include any type of linkage or swivel bearing that would permit the two frame portions 11 and 12 to swivel. Mausser discloses releasable members 13 can be dismantled to change the felt, but Mausser does not disclose installing or deinstalling rollers.

The Office action on page 3 relates the swivel bearing claimed in claim 1 to the linkages 18, 18', and 18". Even if a linkage 18, 18', and 18" of Mausser was considered to be a swivel bearing, which it is not, Mausser would still fail to teach or suggest at least one element of claim 1. In particular, Mausser would fail to teach or suggest the bearing blocks because bearings 4 and 5 are not bearing blocks; they are bearings. Furthermore, the linkage 18, 18', and 18" are used in conjunction with the cylinder 17 to adjust the pressing force between rollers 2 and 3. Therefore, Mausser would still fail to teach or suggest the top part swiveling open by way of the swivel bearing, as required by claim 1.

The inclusion of Wuestner and/or Fuentes do not remedy the deficiencies of Mausser. Wuestner discloses arranging an electric motor drive on each side of the rollers to improve operation of the roll press, and Fuentes discloses interconnecting the drives by an electrical shaft so that the rollers rotate at the same speed. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the

combined teachings of Mausser, Wuestner and Fuentes fail to teach the claimed subject matter taken as a whole, i.e., a compacting press for powdery to granular bulk materials.

Furthermore, Applicant submits that there would have been no motivation based on the teachings of Mausser, Wuestner and Fuentes to combine their respective teachings to produce a compacting press for powdery to granular bulk materials. Mausser relates to a device for dewatering mixtures of fibrous and liquid materials. Wuestner discloses arranging an electric motor drive on each side of the rollers to improve operation of the roll press, and Fuentes discloses interconnecting the drives by an electrical shaft so that the rollers rotate at the same speed. However, the references do not disclose installation and deinstallation of the rollers, a swivel bearing, or the top part swiveling open by way of the swivel bearing.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is patentable over the cited references, and Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.


### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the claim 1 is in condition for allowance and request favorable action. The Examiner is welcome to contact Applicant's attorney at the number below with any questions.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 6, 2007  
PTO Reg. 56,471

Tel. (617) 526-9717  
Fax (617) 526-9899

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Scott K. Witonsky  
Attorney for the Applicant  
Proskauer Rose LLP  
One International Place  
Boston, MA 02110

Attachment: Clean Version of the Amendment to the Specification